The Profanation of the Sacred Assembly: A Scholarly Rebuke of the "Tea Party" Model in Protestant Small Group Bible Studies

Swintas Sēiminiskas Pagaūdisna: Gelehrtas Engraudīsna prēi "Tējas Swēntan"

Mōdelin en Prōtestantiskans Ūnkrans Grūpans Bīblijas Studijans

褻瀆神聖聚會：對新教小組查經淪為「茶會」模式之學術斥責

- Frank Leo 劉宗唐 משה הלוי *Φραγκίσκος Μωυσῆς Λευίτάκης*
משה לוין (לעווין)

I. INTRODUCTION / ENPRESTALLĪSNA / 導論

The phenomenon of transforming Sunday school small groups into social gatherings—replete with idle chatter, empty laughter, and theologically uninformed opinion-sharing—represents one of the most insidious corruptions of ecclesiastical education in contemporary Protestantism. What was once intended as a setting for serious, reverent engagement with Holy Scripture has, in many congregations, degenerated into what can only be described as a "tea party": a casual social affair where entertainment supersedes edification, where human opinion replaces divine revelation, and where the sacred text is subjected to the unrestrained eisegesis of untrained laypeople.

Sta perlānkisna perlāikujas Swintadēiniskans skūlins ūnkrans grūpans en sōcialiskans sēiminiskans—pilnans tūsnan klabāsnan, pāustan smējan, be teōlōgiskai nebillītans opīnijans dāsnan—prēistallā ainan ezze tēn plūsimman pagaūdisnan ekklēsiastiskas erudīcijans en dēinintiskan Prōtestantismu. Ka bēi kadēsmu intentiōnitan kāigi pāusan sēriōziskan, sakrāmintiskan engagemēntan sen Swintans Skriptūrans, ast en dāugins assemblēins degenerēwusi en stan ka turri būtwei teīktan "tējas swēntan": kazuālin sōcialiskan affēran kwēi zabāwa enprestallā edifikācijan, kwēi zmōniskan opīnija perlāikā dēiwiskan rewalācijan, be kwēi swīntas tekstas ast endāts neaulāikintai eisegēsin neizmukintan lāikans.

將主日學小組轉變為社交聚會——充斥著閒聊、空洞的笑聲、以及缺乏神學訓練之人的意見分享——這一現象，代表了當代新教教會教育中最為隱蔽的腐敗之一。原本旨在作為嚴肅、虔敬地研讀聖經之場所，如今在許多會眾中已退化為只能被描述為「茶會」的形式：一種隨意的社交活動，其中娛樂取代了造就，人的意見取代了神的啟示，聖經文本遭受未經訓練之平信徒毫無節制的私意解經。

This essay shall demonstrate, from Scripture itself, from the teaching of the Apostles and our Lord Jesus Christ, and from the testimony of faithful teachers across the Christian tradition, that such a practice is not merely inadvisable but constitutes a direct violation of biblical mandate. We shall then articulate what a proper, biblically-grounded small group study ought to resemble.

Šī skriptūra izrōdīs, ezze Skriptūras pašas, ezze mukinsnans Apōstulans be nūsan Rikījas Jēsus Kristus, be ezze līudijimans tikrōmans mukinātajans krsa Kristiāniskan tradīcijan, ka tālis praktīka ast ni tēngi nepawīdaula, bet prēistallā tīkran perlāuženan bībliskas mandātas. Mes pōstam izteīksim sta ka tikra, bībliskai gruntēwintā ūnkra grūpa studija turri gūlai līkutwei.

本文將從聖經本身、使徒與我們主耶穌基督的教導，以及橫跨基督教傳統之忠信教師的見證來證明：此種做法不僅僅是不可取的，更構成了對聖經命令的直接違反。隨後，我們將闡明一個正確的、以聖經為根基的小組查經應當呈現何種面貌。

II. THE SCRIPTURAL PROHIBITION AGAINST PRIVATE INTERPRETATION / SKRIPTŪRISKAS DRAUDĪSNA PRĒI PRIWĀTAN INTERPRETĀCIJAN / 聖經對私意解經之禁止

The Apostle Peter, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, declared with unmistakable clarity:

Apōstuls Pēteris, peisānts pō Swīntas Dwāsses inspirācijan, teīkwa sen neizzēimingiskan klāritātin:

使徒彼得在聖靈感動下寫作時，以無可誤解的清晰宣告：

"Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter 1:20–21, KJV)

「第一要緊的，該知道經上所有的預言沒有可隨私意解說的；因為預言從來沒有出於人意的，乃是人被聖靈感動，說出神的話來。」（彼得後書一章20-21節）

The Jamieson-Fausset-Brown *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible* (1871) provides the decisive exegetical framework for this passage. Robert Jamieson explains that "private interpretation" (Greek: *epilusis*) here refers to that which "the sacred writer could not always fully interpret, though being the speaker or writer... was plainly not of his own, but of God's disclosure, origination, and inspiration." The commentary further clarifies: "The parallelism to 2 Peter 1:16 shows that 'private interpretation,' contrasted with 'moved by the Holy Ghost,' here answers to 'fables

devised by (human) wisdom.'" The commentary emphatically concludes that "as the word is the Holy Spirit's, it cannot be interpreted by its readers (any more than by its writers) by their mere private human powers."

Jamieson-Fausset-Brown *Kōmentārs Krītiskas be Izskaidawingis prēi Wissans Bīblijan* (1871) endā dēcīdiskan ezegētiskan rāmjan prei šin passāžan. Robert Jamieson izskaidā ka "priwāta interpretācija" (grēkiskai: *epilusis*) šēr referēi en stan "ka swīntas peisātajs ni galijā wisadēn pilnai interpretētwei... bēi klārai ni sēisan, bet Dēiwas endāsna, izēisna be inspirācija." Kōmentārs tālais klārifīcei: "Paralēlismus prēi 2 Pēt. 1:16 izrōdā ka 'priwāta interpretācija,' kontrastēwintā sen 'bewēgti ezze Swīntas Dwāsses,' šēr atsakkā prēi 'fābulas izgudrēwintas ezze (zmōniskas) wīsdisku.'"

Jamieson-Fausset-Brown《全本聖經批判及解釋性註釋》(1871年)為此段經文提供了決定性的釋經框架。Robert Jamieson解釋說,「私意解說」(希臘文:*epilusis*)此處指的是「神聖的寫作者自己不能總是完全解釋的……這顯然不是出於他自己的,而是出於神的揭示、起源與默示。」該註釋進一步闡明:「與彼得後書一章16節的平行結構表明,『私意解說』與『被聖靈感動』形成對比,此處對應於『出於(人的)智慧所虛構的寓言』。」該註釋斷然總結道:「既然這道是聖靈的,就不能由讀者(正如不能由寫作者)僅憑他們私人的人類能力來解釋。」

Matthew Henry, in his *Concise Commentary*, similarly affirms that Scripture's meaning is not subject to individual determination but must be understood within the framework established by the Holy Spirit who authored it. He writes that the prophets "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" and thus no individual—regardless of personal conviction—may set himself up as the final arbiter of textual meaning apart from the Spirit's intended sense.

Matthew Henry在其《簡明註釋》中同樣確認,聖經的意義不受個人決定的支配,而必須在撰寫它的聖靈所建立的框架內被理解。他寫道,先知們「被聖靈感動說出」,因此沒有任何個

人——無論其個人確信如何——可以將自己設立為脫離聖靈原意之經文意義的最終裁決者。

III. THE APOSTOLIC WARNING AGAINST UNQUALIFIED TEACHING / APŌSTULISKAS ENGRAUDĪSNA PRĒI NEKWALIFICĒTAN MUKINSNAN / 使徒對不合格教導之警告

The Apostle James issues a solemn and terrifying admonition:

Apōstuls Jakōbus izdā slēmnan be baismingan engraudīsnan:

使徒雅各發出莊嚴而令人敬畏的警告：

"My brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation." (James 3:1, KJV)

「我的弟兄們，不要多人作師傅，因為曉得我們要受更重的判斷。」（雅各書三章1節）

The word "masters" (Greek: *didaskaloi*—teachers) carries the weight of one who formally instructs others in divine truth. James does not merely suggest caution; he invokes eschatological judgment. The one who presumes to teach Scripture without adequate preparation, training, and calling assumes upon himself a burden of accountability that, if unfulfilled, results in "greater condemnation" (*meizon krima*).

"師傅"一詞（希臘文：*didaskaloi*——教師）承載著正式教導他人神聖真理之人的分量。雅各不僅僅是建議謹慎；他援引了末世論的審判。那些擅自在沒有充分預備、訓練和呼召的情況下教導聖經之人，將自己承擔了一個責任的重擔——若未能履行，將招致「更重的判斷」（*meizon krima*）。

Bilā "mukinātajai" (grēkiskai: *didaskaloi*) nēsā swāran stēisan ka fōrmāli mukinā kitans en dēiwiskans tikrōmans. Jakōbus ni tēngi izteīkā pagaūbisnan; ōns enwākā eskātolōgiskan sūdan. Stēi ka prēisummā mukīntwei Skriptūran šlāit adekvātan

preparācijan, mukinisnan be wākāsnan, prēisēimā ezze sin swāran atskaitōmisku ka, ikkai neizpildintan, izēit en "plūsimman verurtēilungan" (*meizon krima*).

John F. MacArthur, in his extensive teaching on this passage, has consistently maintained that the contemporary evangelical church has dangerously trivialized the teaching office. He argues that allowing untrained individuals to offer their personal opinions on Scripture as though they were legitimate interpretation constitutes a violation of the Apostle's command. MacArthur has stated that Bible study must be governed by sound hermeneutical principles—grammatical-historical exegesis—and not by subjective emotional responses or pooled ignorance. The small group setting does not exempt participants from the standards God has set for the handling of His Word.

約翰·麥克阿瑟在對此段經文的廣泛教導中，始終堅持認為當代福音派教會已危險地輕忽了教導的職分。他論證說，允許未經訓練之人提供他們對聖經的個人意見，彷彿那些是合法的解經，這構成了對使徒命令的違反。麥克阿瑟表明，查經必須受健全的釋經學原則——文法歷史釋經法——所管理，而非受主觀的情感反應或匯集的無知所支配。小組的環境並不豁免參與者遵守神為處理祂話語所設立的標準。

John F. MacArthur, en sēisan plātan mukinsnans ezze šin passāžan, ast tērpingiskai turēwuns ka dēinintiskas ewangelikālas eklēsija ast nisārgiskai triwializēwusi mukinsnans amtan. Ōns argumentēi ka endāsna neizmukintan persōnans prēistallātwei sēisan persōniskans opīnijans ezze Skriptūran kāigi bēi tikras interpretācijas prēistallā perlāuženan Apōstulas prēipīlsnas. MacArthur ast teīkwuns ka Bīblijas studija turri būtwei wadīta ezze sūndan hermēneutiskans prīncipans—grammatiskai-histōriskan ezegēsin—be ni ezze subjektīwans emōciōnaliskans atsakkans ader akumulēwintan nezināsnan.

Pastor Stephen Tong, the renowned Reformed evangelical preacher of Southeast Asia, has repeatedly emphasized in his expository ministry that the pulpit—and by extension,

any setting of biblical instruction—is not a place for human opinions but for the proclamation of God's revealed truth. Tong's insistence on theological precision and doctrinal substance stands as a powerful rebuke to those who would reduce Bible study to a forum for untrained speculation.

唐崇榮牧師，東南亞著名的改革宗福音派傳道人，在其釋經事工中反覆強調：講台——以及由此延伸的任何聖經教導場所——不是人類意見的場所，而是宣講神所啟示之真理的地方。唐崇榮對神學精確性和教義實質的堅持，構成了對那些將查經降格為未受訓者臆測論壇之人的有力斥責。

IV. THE SIN OF IDLE TALK AND EMPTY LAUGHTER IN THE ASSEMBLY / GRĒKAN TŪSNAS KLABĀSNAS BE PĀUSTAS SMĒJAS EN SĒIMINISKĀ / 在聚會中閒談與空笑之罪

The Apostle Paul, writing to the Ephesians, commands:

Apōstuls Paulus, peisānts prēi Efēzijans, prēipīlā:

使徒保羅寫信給以弗所人時，命令道：

"Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks." (Ephesians 5:4, KJV)

「淫詞、妄語，和戲笑的話都不相宜；總要說感謝的話。」（以弗所書五章4節）

The Greek word *eutrapelia* (jesting) refers not merely to obscene humor but to the turning of conversation toward levity and frivolity when gravity is demanded. Paul classifies such behavior alongside "filthiness" (*aischrotes*) and "foolish talking" (*morologia*)—placing empty laughter and idle jesting in the category of conduct unbecoming of saints. When a Bible study gathering becomes characterized primarily

by laughter, jokes, and social banter rather than the reverent exposition of Scripture, it has crossed from the edifying into the profane.

希臘詞 *eutrapelia*（戲笑）不僅指淫穢的幽默，更指在需要莊重時將對話轉向輕浮和瑣碎。保羅將此類行為與「淫詞」(*aischrotes*) 和「妄語」(*morologia*) 並列——將空洞的笑聲和閒話歸入不適合聖徒之行為的類別。當一個查經聚會的主要特徵變成笑聲、笑話和社交閒聊，而非對聖經虔敬的解說時，它已從造就跨入了褻瀆。

Grēkiskas bilā *eutrapelia* (glaudāsna) referēi ni tēngi prēi nekrāntan humōran bet prēi stan perlānkisnan gesprekkas en leichtsinnisku be tūsnisku kadēi sērōziskan ast prawērstai. Paulus klassificēi tālin elgīsnan krsa "nekrāntisku" (*aischrotes*) be "glūpan klabāsnan" (*morologia*)—pēstan pāustan smējan be tūsnan glaudāsnan en katēgorijan ni auderēwingas swintāmans. Kadēi Bīblijas studijas sēiminiska stāi charakterizēwintā pirzdau-wissā ezze smējan, glaudāsnans, be sōcialiskans plappans prestans reverēntiskan ezpōzicijan Skriptūras, ōna ast krēiwusi ezze edifikācisku en prōfānan.

Charles H. Spurgeon, the Prince of Preachers, maintained an unyielding standard regarding the seriousness with which Scripture must be approached. He declared: "Visit many good books, but live in the Bible." Spurgeon understood that the Word of God is not entertainment, not a pretext for social gathering, but the very bread of spiritual life that demands disciplined, focused, and reverent attention. His sermons at the Metropolitan Tabernacle were not marked by frivolity but by the thundering exposition of divine truth—a model that small group leaders would do well to emulate.

查爾斯·司布真，「傳道者中的王子」，對待聖經所需之嚴肅性保持了毫不妥協的標準。他宣告：「訪問許多好書，但要住在聖經裡。」司布真明白神的話語不是娛樂，不是社交聚會的藉口，而是靈命的真正糧食，需要有紀律的、專注的、虔敬的關注。他在都城會幕的講道不以輕浮為標誌，而是以神聖真理的雷鳴般解說為標誌——一個小組帶領者應當效法的模式。

Charles H. Spurgeon, Mukinātajans Rikījs, turēwa nenugistiskan standārtan ezze sērōziskun sen kān Skriptūra turri būtwei prēieitan. Ōns teīkwa: "Lānkais dāugins lābans grāmatans, bet gīwais en Bīblijan." Spurgeon supprata ka Dēiwas Bilā ni ast zabāwa, ni ast pretteksts prēi sōcialiskan sēiminiskan, bet ast tikra dēinanā dwāssiskas gīwatas ka prawērstā disciplinēwintai, fokusēwintai, be reverēntiskai attencijan.

Derek Prince, the distinguished Bible teacher whose expository method combined scholarly rigor with spiritual depth, consistently taught that Bible study requires discipline—the discipline of reading systematically, studying contextually, and submitting personal opinions to the authority of the text itself. Prince warned against the tendency to approach Scripture casually, insisting that believers must come to the Word with the posture of students, not critics or entertainers.

葉光明，這位傑出的聖經教師——其釋經方法結合了學術嚴謹與靈性深度——始終教導查經需要紀律：系統性閱讀的紀律、依據上下文研究的紀律、以及將個人意見順服於經文本身權威的紀律。葉光明警告不可以隨意的態度來接近聖經，堅持認為信徒必須以學生的姿態而非批評者或娛樂者的姿態來到神的道面前。

V. THE BIBLICAL MODEL: NEHEMIAH 8 AND THE APOSTOLIC PATTERN / BĪBLISKAS MŌDELIS: NEHĒMIJA 8 BE APŌSTULISKAS PRŌTOTYPAS / 聖經模式：尼希米記第八章與使徒的典範

Scripture itself provides the definitive model for how God's Word is to be taught and received in community. In Nehemiah 8:8, we read:

Skriptūra pati endā definitīwan mōdelin kāigi Dēiwas Bilā turri būtwei mukintan be preiiemtan en kōmūnijan. En Nehēmija 8:8, mes skaitāmai:

聖經本身提供了神的話語當如何在群體中被教導和領受的確定性模式。在尼希米記八章8節，我們讀到：

"So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." (Nehemiah 8:8, KJV)

「他們清清楚楚地念神的律法書，講明意思，使百姓明白所念的。」（尼希米記八章8節）

Here we observe three essential elements of proper biblical instruction: (1) the public reading of the text (*they read distinctly*); (2) authoritative explanation of meaning (*gave the sense*); and (3) ensuring comprehension among the hearers (*caused them to understand*). Notice what is entirely absent: there is no invitation for untrained individuals to "share what this passage means to me." There is no roundtable of opinions. There is no casual atmosphere of social entertainment. The setting is one of reverent instruction by qualified teachers (Ezra and the Levites) to an attentive assembly.

此處我們觀察到正確聖經教導的三個基本要素：（一）公開誦讀經文（清清楚楚地念）；（二）帶有權威的意義解釋（講明意思）；（三）確保聽眾的理解（使百姓明白）。請注意完全缺席的是什麼：沒有邀請未經訓練之人「分享這段經文對我意味著什麼」。沒有意見的圓桌會議。沒有社交娛樂的隨意氛圍。這一場景是由合格的教師（以斯拉和利未人）向專注的會眾進行虔敬的教導。

Šēr mes ebzīrai trins essentiālans elemēntans tikras bībliskas instrukciijas: (1) pūbliskan skaitāsnan tekstas (*ōnai skaitā klārai*); (2) autōritātiskan izskaidāsnan zēnsan (*endā zēnsan*); be (3) enzūrgisnan kōmprehēnsijan sirzdau klausītajans (*endā supprastwei*). Ebzīreiti sta ka pilnai absēntai ast: ni ast enwākāsna neizmukintan persōnans "dalītwei stan ka šis passāžas zēnsenā prēi min." Ni ast kruglas stālas opīnijans. Ni ast kazuāla atmōsphēra sōcialiskā zabāwā. Sta pāusan ast ainan

reverēntiskas instrukcijas ezze kwalificēwintans mukinātajans (Ezra be Lewītans) prēi attentīwan sēiminiskan.

This Nehemiah 8 model is precisely what Dr. Michael S. Heiser advocated throughout his career when he insisted that "the context of the Bible is the context that produced it—the ancient Near East/Mediterranean," and that readers must not impose their modern assumptions upon the text. Heiser's methodology—later termed "the Naked Bible" approach—rejected the pooling of uninformed opinions in favor of rigorous contextual study guided by those trained in the original languages, historical backgrounds, and theological frameworks of Scripture.

這正是已故的 Michael S. Heiser 博士在其整個職業生涯中所倡導的尼希米記第八章模式。他堅持認為「聖經的語境就是產生它的語境——古代近東/地中海世界」，讀者不可將他們的現代假設強加於經文之上。Heiser的方法論——後來被稱為「裸聖經」方法——拒絕匯集無知的意見，而主張由受過原文語言、歷史背景和聖經神學框架訓練之人所引導的嚴謹語境研究。

Gary Hamrick of Cornerstone Chapel exemplifies this approach in practice: his verse-by-verse expository teaching through entire books of the Bible demonstrates that proper Bible study—whether from the pulpit or in a small group—must proceed through careful, sequential exposition rather than topical meanderings or free-form discussion.

Gary Hamrick（基石教會）在實踐中體現了這一方法：他逐節逐卷地釋經教導整卷聖經書卷，證明了正確的查經——無論是在講台上還是在小組中——必須通過仔細的、按序的解說來進行，而非主題性的漫談或自由形式的討論。

VI. THE APOSTLE PAUL'S MANDATE FOR BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION / APŌSTULAS PĀULAS MANDĀTA PRĒI BĪBLISKAN INSTRŪKCIJAN / 使徒保羅對聖經教導之命令

Paul writes to Timothy:

Paulus peisā prēi Timōtejan:

保羅寫信給提摩太：

"Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine." (1 Timothy 4:13, KJV)

「你要以宣讀、勸勉、教導為念，直等到我來。」（提摩太前書四章13節）

Three activities are mandated: *reading* (the public reading of Scripture), *exhortation* (the application of Scripture to life), and *doctrine* (the systematic teaching of biblical truth). Paul does not say, "Until I come, let everyone share their feelings about the passage." He does not say, "Host a social gathering with light refreshments and invite opinions." He commands—under apostolic authority—a structured, content-driven ministry of the Word.

三項活動是被命令的：宣讀（公開誦讀聖經）、勸勉（將聖經應用於生活）、以及教導（系統性地教導聖經真理）。保羅並未說：「直等到我來，讓每個人分享他們對經文的感受。」他並未說：「舉辦一個有輕食的社交聚會並邀請意見。」他在使徒權柄下命令的是——一個有結構的、以內容為導向的話語事工。

Trins ēntergīsenijas ast mandātai: *skaitāsna* (pūbliskas skaitāsna Skriptūras), *engraudīsna* (applikācija Skriptūras prēi gīwatan), be *dōktrīna* (sistēmatiskas mukinsna bībliskas tikrōmas). Paulus ni teīkā "Ēntergīja kadēi wīsai dalīja sēisan jūtans ezze passāžan." Ōns ni teīkā "Sēiminais sōcialiskāi sen lengwans ēdijans be enwākeiti opīnijans." Ōns prēipīlā—pō apōstuliskan autōritātin—strūkturēwintan, sōdau-wedātan ministērijan Bilāsses.

Furthermore, Paul admonishes Timothy directly:

此外，保羅直接警誡提摩太：

"Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." (2 Timothy 2:15, KJV)

「你當竭力在神面前得蒙喜悅，作無愧的工人，按著正意分解真理的道。」（提摩太後書二章15節）

The phrase "rightly dividing" (Greek: *orthotomeo*—to cut straight) implies precision, training, and skill. It is the language of a craftsman, not an amateur. One does not "rightly divide" the Word of Truth by soliciting uninformed opinions around a living room. Robby Gallaty, in his discipleship methodology, has emphasized that true disciple-making requires intentional teaching and structured Scripture engagement—not aimless discussion masquerading as spiritual depth.

「按著正意分解」（希臘文：*orthotomeo*——直直地切割）意味著精確、訓練和技能。這是工匠的語言，而非業餘者的語言。人不能通過在客廳中徵求無知的意見來「按著正意分解」真理的道。Robby Gallaty在其門徒訓練方法論中強調，真正的門徒培訓需要刻意的教導和有結構的聖經研讀——而非偽裝成屬靈深度的漫無目的之討論。

Voddie Baucham has powerfully articulated the crisis of biblical illiteracy in the modern church, arguing that it stems directly from the abandonment of rigorous, expository Bible teaching in favor of experience-driven, opinion-based group discussions. Baucham insists that the church must return to a model where trained teachers exposit the text and congregants learn to submit to the authority of Scripture rather than imposing their own frameworks upon it.

Voddie Baucham有力地闡述了現代教會聖經文盲的危機，論證它直接源自放棄嚴謹的釋經式聖經教導，而轉向以經驗為驅動、以意見為基礎的小組討論。Baucham堅持教會必須回歸一個模式：由受過訓練的教師解說經文，會眾學習順服聖經的權威，而非將他們自己的框架強加於其上。

VII. THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST: HOW JESUS TAUGHT SCRIPTURE / KRISTUS PRŌTOTYPAS: KĀIGI JĒSUS MUKINNA SKRIPTŪRAN / 基督的榜樣：耶穌如何教導聖經

Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself provides the supreme model of how Scripture is to be handled. In the synagogue at Nazareth:

我們的主耶穌基督親自提供了如何處理聖經的最高模式。在拿撒勒的會堂中：

"And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written... And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." (Luke 4:16–17, 21, KJV)

「耶穌來到拿撒勒，就是他長大的地方。在安息日，照他平常的規矩進了會堂，站起來要念聖經。有人把先知以賽亞的書交給他，他就打開，找到一處寫著說……他就對他們說：『今天這經應驗在你們耳中了。』」（路加福音四章16-17、21節）

Jesus did not ask, "What does everyone think this passage means?" He did not solicit opinions. He did not turn the reading into a social occasion. He read the text authoritatively and then declared its meaning with absolute certainty. This is the pattern: authoritative reading followed by authoritative exposition. The teacher speaks; the congregation receives.

耶穌並未問：「大家認為這段經文是什麼意思？」祂並未徵求意見。祂並未將誦讀變成社交場合。祂帶著權柄誦讀經文，然後以絕對的確定性宣告其意義。這就是模式：帶有權柄的誦讀，隨之以帶有權柄的解說。教師說話；會眾領受。

Jēsus ni prassā "Ka wīsai sengīdā šis passāžas zēnsenā ast?" Ōns ni izprassā opīnijans. Ōns ni perlāikā skaitāsnan en sōcialiskan pāusan. Ōns skaitā tekstan autōritātiskai be pōstan teīkwa sēisan zēnsenan sen absōlūtan tikruminskan. Šis ast prōtotypas: autōritātiska skaitāsna sekāta ezze autōritātiskan ezpōzicijan. Mukinātajs klabā; sēiminiska preiiemā.

Similarly, on the road to Emmaus:

同樣地，在以馬忤斯的路上：

"And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." (Luke 24:27, KJV)

「於是從摩西和眾先知起，凡經上所指著自己的話都給他們講解明白了。」（路加福音二十四章27節）

The word "expounded" (Greek: *diermeneuo*—to interpret thoroughly, to explain fully) indicates a systematic, comprehensive, authoritative explanation—not a group discussion. Jesus was the Teacher; the disciples were the learners. This hierarchy of instruction is not incidental to the narrative; it is normative for all Christian education.

「講解」一詞（希臘文：*diermeneuo*——徹底地解釋，充分地說明）表示一種系統性的、全面的、帶有權柄的解釋——而非小組討論。耶穌是教師；門徒是學習者。這種教導的層級結構在敘事中並非偶然；它對一切基督教教育都是規範性的。

Bishop Robert Barron has consistently emphasized that the Catholic intellectual tradition understands Scripture as requiring trained, guided interpretation within the living tradition of the Church—not as a text to be subjected to the whims of individual readers gathering casually. While writing from a Catholic perspective, his insistence on the necessity of informed, theologically grounded exposition applies equally to any Christian small group setting.

Bishop Robert Barron始終強調，天主教知識傳統理解聖經為需要在教會活生生的傳統中接受受過訓練的、有引導的解釋——而非一部交由隨意聚集的個別讀者任意處置的文本。雖然是從天主教視角寫作，但他對有知識的、以神學為根基之解說之必要性的堅持，同樣適用於任何基督教小組查經的場景。

Wāldninks Robert Barron ast tērpingiskai pabrēžwuns ka Kathōliskas intellektuālas tradīcijas supprassenis Skriptūras ast kāigi prawērstantas izmukintas, wadītas interpretācijas en gīwantiskan tradīcijan Eklēsijas—ni kāigi tekstan ka turri būtwei endāts prēi kaprizans atskirans skaitātajans kazuāli sēiminantans.

VIII. THE BEREAN MODEL RIGHTLY UNDERSTOOD / BĒRĒJAS MŌDELIS TIKRAI SUPPRASTAI / 正確理解庇哩亞模式

Many proponents of the "share your opinion" model erroneously appeal to Acts 17:11:

許多「分享你的意見」模式的支持者錯誤地援引使徒行傳十七章11節：

"These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so." (Acts 17:11, KJV)

「這地方的人賢於帖撒羅尼迦的人，甘心領受這道，天天考查聖經，要曉得這道是與不是。」（使徒行傳十七章11節）

However, a careful reading reveals that the Bereans were not offering their private opinions about what Scripture meant. They were *verifying* the apostolic teaching against the existing Scripture—the Old Testament. They had a teacher (Paul) proclaiming truth, and they were examining whether his teaching aligned with what was already written. This is the opposite of a leaderless circle where everyone offers equal opinions. The

Bereans submitted to authoritative teaching while exercising discernment—a far cry from the modern "tea party" model where no authoritative teaching exists at all.

然而，仔細的閱讀揭示出庇哩亞人並非在提供他們對聖經意義的私人意見。他們是在將使徒的教導與現有的聖經——舊約——進行核實。他們有一位教師（保羅）宣講真理，而他們在查驗他的教導是否與已寫下的相符。這與一個人人提供平等意見的無領袖圈子恰恰相反。庇哩亞人順服帶有權柄的教導，同時操練分辨力——這與現代「茶會」模式（其中根本不存在帶有權柄的教導）相去甚遠。

Frank Turek, in his apologetics work, has emphasized that truth is objective—it exists independent of personal opinion. When applied to Bible study, this means that the meaning of a text is determined by the author's intent (the Holy Spirit through the human author), not by the reader's subjective response. A proper Bible study seeks to discover what the text *means*, not what it *means to me*—a distinction that the "tea party" model obliterates entirely.

Frank Turek在其護教工作中強調真理是客觀的——它獨立於個人意見而存在。應用於查經時，這意味著經文的意義由作者的意圖（聖靈透過人類作者）所決定，而非由讀者的主觀反應所決定。一個正確的查經尋求發現經文意味著什麼，而非它對我意味著什麼——這一區分被「茶會」模式完全抹殺。

N.T. Wright, while affirming that every Christian should engage with Scripture, has nonetheless emphasized that proper interpretation requires understanding the historical, cultural, and literary context of biblical texts. Wright's *For Everyone* Bible study guides demonstrate that even accessible Bible study must be structured around careful exposition—not free-form opinion sharing.

N.T. Wright，雖然肯定每位基督徒都應研讀聖經，但仍然強調正確的解經需要理解聖經文本的歷史、文化和文學語境。Wright的《給每個人》查經指南證明，即使是通俗易懂的查經也必須圍繞仔細的解說來建構——而非自由形式的意見分享。

William Lane Craig, one of the foremost Christian philosophers of our time, has repeatedly argued that careful reasoning and rigorous intellectual engagement are essential components of the Christian life. The anti-intellectual atmosphere of the "tea party" Bible study—where depth is sacrificed for comfort and truth is sacrificed for consensus—represents precisely the kind of intellectual abdication that Craig has spent his career opposing.

William Lane Craig，我們時代最傑出的基督教哲學家之一，反覆論證嚴謹的推理和嚴格的智識參與是基督徒生命的基本組成部分。「茶會」查經的反智氛圍——其中深度被犧牲給舒適，真理被犧牲給共識——恰恰代表了Craig畢生職業生涯中所反對的那種智識上的放棄。

IX. THE PROPER STRUCTURE OF A BIBLICAL SMALL GROUP / TIKRAS STRŪKTŪRA BĪBLISKAS ŪNKRAS GRŪPAS / 正確的聖經小組之結構

Based on the scriptural evidence presented above, a truly biblical small group study must include the following elements:

根據以上所呈現的聖經證據，一個真正合乎聖經的小組查經必須包含以下要素：

Grūntēwintai en Skriptūriskans līudijimans prēistallātans ebzūrai, tikrai bībliska ūnkra grūpas studija turri enbilītwei šins elemēntans:

First: A Qualified Teacher-Leader. The study must be led by one who has solid theological training—whether formal seminary education or equivalent rigorous self-study under the guidance of mature teachers. This person bears the responsibility described in James 3:1 and must be able to "rightly divide the word of truth" (2 Timothy 2:15). The role is not that of a "facilitator" who merely asks questions and lets everyone "share," but that of an instructor who teaches with authority grounded in competent exegesis.

第一：合格的教師-帶領者。查經必須由擁有扎實神學訓練之人帶領——無論是正式的神學院教育還是在成熟教師指導下的等效嚴謹自學。此人承擔雅各書三章1節所描述的責任，並且必須能夠「按著正意分解真理的道」（提摩太後書二章15節）。其角色不是一個僅僅提出問題並讓每個人「分享」的「主持人」，而是一位以紮根於合格釋經之權柄來教導的教師。

Pirmā: Kwalificēts Mukinātajs-Wadātajs. Studija turri būtwei wadīta ezze ainan ka turī sūndan teōlōgiskan mukinisnan—ader fōrmālin seminārijas edukācijan ader ekwivalēntan stēngisku pašesstudijan pō wadīsnan izaugusēijans mukinātajans. Šis persōna nēsā atssakōmisku teīktan en Jakōbus 3:1 be turri galētwei "tikrai dalītwei bilān tikrōmas" (2 Timōtejus 2:15). Sta rōla ni ast stēisan "facīlitātōrs" kas tēngi prassā prassēnijans be lāi wissans "dalītwei," bet stēisan instrūktōrs kas mukinā sen autōritātin grūntēwintan en kōmpetēntā ezegēsē.

Fr. Josiah Trenham, in his work on the Orthodox approach to Scripture, has emphasized that the Church Fathers always understood biblical interpretation as an ecclesial activity—one that occurs within the community of faith under qualified guidance, not as an exercise in individual opinion-making. This patristic principle applies with equal force to Protestant small group settings: without a competent teacher, the gathering becomes a pooling of ignorance rather than an encounter with divine truth.

Trenham Tāws Josiah, en sēisan dēllan ezze Ōrtodōksiskan prēieisnan prēi Skriptūran, ast pabrēžwuns ka Eklēsijas Tāwai wisadēn supprata bībliskan interpretācijan kāigi ekklēsiālin ēntergīsenijan—ainan ka stāi en kōmūnijan tikrōmas pō kwalificētan wadīsnan, ni kāigi askēsin en atskirān opīnijā-tikinsnan.

Josiah Trenham神父在其關於東正教聖經方法的著作中強調，教父們始終將聖經解釋理解為教會性的活動——一種在合格引導下於信仰群體中發生的活動，而非個人意見製造的操

練。這一教父原則同等有力地適用於新教小組查經的場景：沒有合格的教師，聚會就成為無知的匯集，而非與神聖真理的相遇。

Dr. Craig Keener, one of the most prolific New Testament scholars of our generation, has dedicated his career to demonstrating the importance of historical-cultural context in biblical interpretation. His multi-volume commentaries exemplify the level of scholarly engagement that should inform—even if at a more accessible level—the teaching that occurs in small group Bible studies. The vast chasm between Keener's rigorous methodology and the casual "what does this verse mean to you?" approach underscores the severity of the problem.

Dr. Craig Keener，我們這一代最多產的新約學者之一，畢生致力於展示歷史文化語境在聖經解釋中的重要性。他的多卷註釋書體現了應當為小組查經中的教導提供信息的那種學術參與水平——即使是在更通俗易懂的層面。Keener嚴謹的方法論與隨意的「這節經文對你意味著什麼？」方法之間的巨大鴻溝，突顯了問題的嚴重性。

Second: The Priority of Text Reading and Exposition. Following the Nehemiah 8 model, the text of Scripture must be read aloud—carefully, reverently, and completely. Then the teacher must "give the sense," explaining what the text meant in its original context, what it means theologically, and how it applies to the Christian life. This is exegesis—drawing meaning *out of* the text—not eisegesis—reading meaning *into* the text.

第二：經文誦讀與解說的優先性。遵循尼希米記第八章的模式，聖經的文本必須被大聲誦讀——仔細地、虔敬地、完整地。然後教師必須「講明意思」，解釋經文在其原始語境中的含義、其神學意義、以及它如何應用於基督徒的生活。這是釋經（exegesis）——從經文中引出意義——而非私意解經（eisegesis）——將意義讀入經文中。

Antrā: Prioritāta Tekstas Skaitāsnas be Ezpōzicijas. Sekānts Nehēmija 8 mōdelin, Skriptūras tekstas turri būtwei skaitāts aūkstai—zūrgingi, reverēntiskai, be pilnai. Pōstan

mukinātajs turri "endātwei zēnsenan," izskaidānts stan ka tekstas zēnsenā en sēisan ōrigināliskan kōntekstan, stan ka ōns zēnsenā teōlōgiskai, be kāigi ōns applicēi prēi Kristiāniskan gīwatan.

Dr. Chuck Missler was renowned for his insistence that "every word, every number, every place name" in Scripture is there by divine design and demands careful study—not casual discussion. His verse-by-verse teaching methodology modeled what a serious approach to Scripture looks like, treating the biblical text as a precision instrument authored by omniscience, not as a conversation starter for social gatherings.

乍得·乘索博士以其堅持聞名：聖經中「每一個詞、每一個數字、每一個地名」都是出於神聖設計而存在的，需要仔細的研究——而非隨意的討論。他的逐節教導方法論示範了認真對待聖經的方式，將聖經文本視為由全知者所撰寫的精密工具，而非社交聚會的談話素材。

Third: Questions for Clarification, Not Opinion. While participants may ask questions, these should be questions seeking clarification of the teacher's exposition or requesting further explanation of difficult passages—not invitations to share personal, uninformed readings. The distinction is between "Teacher, I don't understand what you mean by justification" (a legitimate question) and "Well, I think this verse means that God just wants us to be happy" (eisegesis masquerading as participation).

第三：為求澄清而非意見的提問。雖然參與者可以提問，但這些應是尋求對教師解說之澄清的問題，或是請求對困難經文進一步解釋的問題——而非邀請分享個人的、不知情的讀法。區別在於「教師，我不明白你所說的稱義是什麼意思」（合法的問題）與「嗯，我覺得這節經文是說神只是想讓我們快樂」（偽裝成參與的私意解經）之間。

Trta: Prassēnijas prēi Klārifīkācijan, ni Opīnijan. Amēngi partīcipāntai galā prastwei prassēnijans, šīns turri būtwei prassēnijas prēi klārifīkācijan mukinātajas ezpōzicijas ader prawērstantas tālaisas izskaidāsnas grūtans passāžans—ni enwākāsnans dalītwei persōniskans, nebillītans skaitāsnans.

Cliffe Knechtle, known for his open-air apologetics ministry on university campuses, demonstrates that even in dialogue with skeptics, the Christian teacher maintains authority over the content while engaging questions respectfully. This model—teaching authority combined with responsive engagement—is far superior to the leaderless discussion circle.

Cliffe Knechtle，以其在大學校園的露天護教事工聞名，展示了即使在與懷疑者的對話中，基督教教師也保持對內容的權柄，同時尊重地回應問題。這一模式——教導權柄結合回應性參與——遠優於無領袖的討論圈。

Fourth: An Atmosphere of Reverence, Not Entertainment. The assembly for Bible study is a sacred activity. It is not a coffee hour. It is not a social club. It is not a place for jokes, gossip, or extended personal anecdotes unrelated to the text. Paul's command in 1 Timothy 4:13—"give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine"—presupposes an atmosphere of sober attentiveness, not casual hilarity.

第四：虔敬的氛圍，而非娛樂的氛圍。查經的聚會是一項神聖的活動。它不是咖啡時光。它不是社交俱樂部。它不是講笑話、閒聊八卦或冗長個人軼事（與經文無關者）的場所。保羅在提摩太前書四章13節的命令——「以宣讀、勸勉、教導為念」——預設了一種清醒專注的氛圍，而非隨意的嬉笑。

Ketwirta: Atmōsphēra Reverēncijas, ni Zabāwas. Sēiminiska prēi Bīblijas studijan ast swīnta ēntergīsenija. Ōna ni ast kāfijas stundan. Ōna ni ast sōcialiskan klūban. Ōna ni ast pāusan prēi glaudāsnans, tūsnan klabāsnan, ader izstengtan persōniskans histōrijans ni prēilaūkujas prēi tekstan.

Fr. Lazarus El Antony, the Coptic Orthodox monk whose teaching on spiritual discipline has reached millions, exemplifies the monastic principle that engagement with Scripture is a form of prayer—requiring silence, attention, and reverence. When a Bible study group treats the gathering as entertainment, it profanes what is sacred.

Lazarus El Antony神父，這位科普特東正教修士——其關於靈性操練的教導已觸及數百萬人——體現了修道院的原則：研讀聖經是禱告的一種形式，需要安靜、專注和敬畏。當一個查經小組將聚會視為娛樂時，它褻瀆了神聖之物。

Fr. Seraphim Aldea, in his teachings on the contemplative life, has emphasized that sacred reading (*lectio divina*) requires the reader to approach the text with humility, stillness, and a willingness to be transformed—not with the casualness of social chatter. The monastic witness stands as a permanent rebuke to the trivialization of Scripture in "tea party" settings.

Seraphim Aldea神父在其關於默觀生活的教導中強調，神聖的閱讀（*lectio divina*）要求讀者以謙卑、安靜和願意被改變的心來接近經文——而非以社交閒聊的隨意性。修道院的見證永遠是對「茶會」場景中輕忽聖經之斥責。

X. THE DANGER OF EISEGESIS: READING INTO SCRIPTURE WHAT IS NOT THERE / NISĀRGISKAN EISEGĒSES: SKAITĀNTS EN SKRIPTŪRAN STAN KA NI AST ŠĒR / 私意解經之危險：將不存在之物讀入聖經

When untrained individuals are invited to "share what this passage means to them," the inevitable result is eisegesis—the imposition of personal experiences, cultural assumptions, psychological projections, and theological errors upon the sacred text. This is not merely unhelpful; it is positively harmful, for it teaches participants that Scripture can mean whatever one wishes it to mean—a hermeneutical nihilism that renders the Bible functionally meaningless.

當未經訓練之人被邀請「分享這段經文對他們意味著什麼」時，不可避免的結果就是私意解經——將個人經歷、文化假設、心理投射和神學錯誤強加於聖經文本之上。這不僅僅是無益

的；它是積極有害的，因為它教導參與者聖經可以意味著任何人希望它意味著的——一種使聖經在功能上變得毫無意義的詮釋學虛無主義。

Kadēi neizmukintan persōnans ast enwākātan "dalītwei stan ka šis passāža zēnsenā prēi stans," neizwēngiskas izēisna ast eisegēsis—enpēdan persōniskans ekspēriencijans, kultūriskans presuppōzicijans, psīchōlōgiskans prōjekcijans, be teōlōgiskans blūdans ezze swīntan tekstan. Šis ni ast tēngi neprawernīngi; ōns ast pōzitīwai nisārgingi, ēnti ōns mukinā partīcipāntans ka Skriptūra galā zēnsenātwei wissankādēn ka ains gēidā en ōnan zēnsenātwei.

Peter warned of this very danger:

彼得警告了這一危險：

"As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." (2 Peter 3:16, KJV)

「他一切的信上也都是講論這事。信中有些難明白的，那無學問、不堅固的人強解，如強解別的經書一樣，就自取沉淪。」（彼得後書三章16節）

The word "wrest" (Greek: *strebloo*—to torture, to distort, to twist) reveals the violence done to Scripture when unqualified interpreters handle it. Peter does not say they merely misunderstand; he says they *twist* it—and that this twisting leads to *destruction* (*apoleia*). This is not a game. This is not a social exercise. Allowing the unlearned to publicly interpret Scripture in a group setting without correction or guidance is to participate in the very activity Peter condemns.

「強解」一詞（希臘文：*strebloo*——折磨、扭曲、歪曲）揭示了當不合格的解經者處理聖經時對聖經所施加的暴力。彼得並未說他們僅僅是誤解；他說他們扭曲了它——而這種扭曲導

向沉淪（*apoleia*）。這不是遊戲。這不是社交操練。允許無學問的人在小組場景中公開解釋聖經而無修正或引導，就是參與了彼得所定罪的那種活動。

Bilā "wrest" (grēkiskai: *strebloo*—kankintwei, distortētwei, krēiwintwei) izrōdā stēisan nisārgisku tiktan prēi Skriptūran kadēi nekwalificēti interpretātōrai drūktā ōnan. Pēteris ni teīkā ka ōnai tēngi missupprastā; ōns teīkā ka ōnai *krēiwā* ōnan—be ka šis krēiwisna wadā en *pagaūdisnan* (*apoleia*). Šis ni ast spēlan. Šis ni ast sōciāla askēsis. Lāisna neizmukintan pūbliskai interpretētwei Skriptūran en grūpas pāusan šlāit kōrekcijan ader wadīsnan ast partīcipētwei en šan pašan ēntergīsenijā kan Pēteris endamnā.

Jordan Peterson, though not a theologian per se, has repeatedly emphasized in his Biblical Series lectures that the biblical text possesses a depth and complexity that demands the utmost seriousness of engagement. Peterson has stated that one cannot approach these texts casually—that they contain within them the distilled wisdom of millennia and require careful, sustained, and reverential attention. His insistence on the gravity of the biblical narratives serves as a secular rebuke to those churches that treat Bible study as light entertainment.

Jordan Peterson，雖然嚴格來說不是神學家，但在其聖經系列講座中反覆強調聖經文本擁有深度和複雜性，要求最高程度的嚴肅參與。Peterson表示，人不能以隨意的態度接近這些文本——它們包含了數千年提煉的智慧，需要仔細的、持續的、虔敬的關注。他對聖經敘事之莊重性的堅持，構成了對那些將查經視為輕鬆娛樂之教會的世俗性斥責。

Nate Sala, in his apologetics ministry, has emphasized the importance of epistemological clarity in approaching Scripture—knowing *how* we know what we know, and ensuring that our Bible study methods are sound rather than subjective. His work underscores that proper hermeneutics is not optional but essential.

Nate Sala在其護教事工中強調了以認識論的清晰性接近聖經的重要性——知道我們如何知道我們所知道的，並確保我們的查經方法是健全的而非主觀的。他的工作強調正確的詮釋學不是可選的，而是必不可少的。

John Lennox, the Oxford mathematician and Christian apologist, has demonstrated throughout his career that serious intellectual engagement with matters of faith is not only possible but necessary. The "tea party" model of Bible study—where intellectual rigor is abandoned in favor of emotional sharing—would be antithetical to everything Lennox represents in his own engagement with Scripture and theology.

John Lennox，牛津數學家和基督教護教家，在其整個職業生涯中展示了對信仰事務的嚴肅智識參與不僅是可能的，而且是必要的。「茶會」模式的查經——在其中智識嚴謹被放棄以迎合情感分享——與Lennox在自己與聖經和神學的交往中所代表的一切背道而馳。

XI. THE ROLE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT VERSUS PRIVATE OPINION / SWĪNTAS DWĀSSES RŌLA PRĒI PRIWĀTAI OPĪNIJAI / 聖靈的角色對照私人意見

Some may object: "Does not the Holy Spirit guide every believer into all truth?" (cf. John 16:13). Indeed He does—but the Spirit's illumination is not a license for untrained eisegesis. The Spirit illuminates what is objectively present in the text; He does not create new meanings tailored to individual preferences. The Spirit works *through* proper study, trained minds, and submitted hearts—not *apart from* these means.

有人或許會反對：「聖靈不是引導每位信徒進入一切的真理嗎？」（參約翰福音十六章13節）。確實如此——但聖靈的光照並非未經訓練之私意解經的許可證。聖靈光照的是客觀存在於經文中之物；祂不創造適合個人偏好的新意義。聖靈透過正確的研究、受過訓練的心智和順服的心靈來工作——而非離開這些途徑。

Aīnai galā atsakkātwei: "Ar Swīnta Dwāssi ni wadā wīsan druwnīkan en wissans tikrōmans?" (salīg. Jōan 16:13). Tikrōmingi Ōna wadā—bet Dwāsses illuminācija ni ast licēncija prēi neizmukintan eisegēsin. Dwāssi illuminēi stan ka ast objektīwai presēnts en tekstā; Ōna ni tikintā nēiwans zēnsenijans dēsinātans prēi atskirans preferēncijans. Dwāssi dēlā *per* tikran studijan, izmukintas prōtans, be endātas širdins—ni *šlāit* šins mēdijans.

Dr. Leighton Flowers has emphasized the importance of allowing Scripture to speak for itself within its proper context, rather than forcing theological systems upon the text. While his work primarily addresses soteriological debates, the principle applies equally here: the text has an objective meaning that must be discovered through careful study, not invented through private opinion.

Dr. Leighton Flowers強調了允許聖經在其適當語境中為自己說話的重要性，而非將神學體系強加於經文之上。雖然他的工作主要涉及救恩論的爭論，但原則同樣適用於此：經文有一個必須通過仔細研究來發現的客觀意義，而非通過私人意見來發明的意義。

Alvin Plantinga, the preeminent Reformed epistemologist, has argued that properly basic beliefs—including beliefs about Scripture's meaning—must be grounded in appropriate epistemic faculties functioning in proper environments. A "tea party" Bible study, where social pressure and emotional dynamics override careful reasoning, does not constitute an environment conducive to proper epistemic function. It is, in Plantinga's framework, an environment more likely to produce *unwarranted* beliefs about Scripture's meaning.

Alvin Plantinga，卓越的改革宗認識論學家，論證了適當的基本信念——包括關於聖經意義的信念——必須扎根於在適當環境中正常運作的認知官能。一個「茶會」查經，在其中社會壓力和情感動力凌駕於仔細推理之上，並不構成有利於適當認知功能的環境。在Plantinga的框架中，它是一個更可能產生關於聖經意義之無保證信念的環境。

J. Warner Wallace, the cold-case detective turned Christian apologist, brings an investigative methodology to Scripture that demands evidence, careful reasoning, and submission to objective facts. His approach stands as a model for how Bible study should proceed: with the rigor of a detective examining evidence, not the casualness of friends sharing opinions over tea.

J. Warner Wallace，從冷案偵探轉變為基督教護教家，為聖經研究帶來了一種要求證據、仔細推理和順服客觀事實的調查方法論。他的方法作為查經應當如何進行的模式：以偵探審查證據的嚴謹性，而非朋友們喝茶聊天分享意見的隨意性。

XII. THE TESTIMONY OF THE CHURCH ACROSS TRADITIONS / LĪUDIJIMAS EKLĒSIJAS KRSA TRADĪCIJANS / 跨傳統之教會見證

The witness against the "tea party" model is not confined to any single tradition. Across Protestantism, Catholicism, and Eastern Orthodoxy, faithful teachers have consistently affirmed the necessity of qualified, authoritative, reverent exposition of Scripture.

對「茶會」模式的見證不限於任何單一傳統。橫跨新教、天主教和東正教，忠信的教師始終一致地肯定了合格的、帶有權柄的、虔敬的聖經解說之必要性。

Līudijimas prēi "tējas swēntas" mōdelin ni ast endāts en ainasmu atskirā tradīcijā. Krsa Prōtestantismun, Kathōlicismun, be Austrumōrtodōksiskun, tikrōmi mukinātajai ast tērpingiskai teīkwuši prawersningiskun kwalificētas, autōritātiskas, reverēntiskas ezpōzicijas Skriptūras.

Fr. Stephen De Young, an Orthodox biblical scholar, has demonstrated through his extensive work on the "Whole Counsel of God" podcast that biblical interpretation requires deep knowledge of Second Temple Judaism, patristic exegesis, and the liturgical tradition of the Church. His scholarship stands as a testament to the depth

required for proper biblical interpretation—a depth that cannot be achieved through casual opinion-sharing.

Stephen De Young神父，東正教聖經學者，通過其在「神的全備旨意」播客上的大量工作展示了聖經解釋需要對第二聖殿時期猶太教、教父釋經和教會禮儀傳統的深入知識。他的學術成就證明了正確聖經解釋所需要的深度——這種深度不可能通過隨意的意見分享來達成。

Fr. Chad Ripperger, the traditional Catholic exorcist and theologian, has spoken extensively on the necessity of proper intellectual formation before one presumes to teach or interpret sacred texts. His emphasis on the hierarchy of authority in matters of doctrine and interpretation stands as a powerful corrective to the egalitarian assumptions of the "everyone's opinion is equally valid" model.

Chad Ripperger神父，傳統天主教驅魔師和神學家，廣泛論述了在人擅自教導或解釋神聖文本之前適當智識養成的必要性。他對教義和解釋事務中權威層級的強調，構成了對「每個人的意見同等有效」模式之平等主義假設的有力修正。

Dr. Karlo Broussard, the Catholic apologist, has emphasized the importance of trained, systematic engagement with Scripture that respects the tradition of interpretation handed down through the centuries. His apologetics ministry consistently demonstrates that biblical interpretation is not a free-for-all but a disciplined endeavor requiring formation and guidance.

Karlo Broussard博士，天主教護教家，強調了對聖經進行受過訓練的、系統性的研讀之重要性——這種研讀尊重歷世紀傳承下來的解釋傳統。他的護教事工始終展示聖經解釋不是放任自流的事，而是需要養成和引導的有紀律之努力。

Dr. John Bergsma, Catholic biblical theologian, has shown through his academic work that understanding Scripture requires knowledge of covenant theology, ancient Near Eastern backgrounds, and the typological reading methods employed by the biblical

authors themselves. This level of interpretive competence cannot emerge from a circle of untrained individuals sharing impressions.

John Bergsma博士，天主教聖經神學家，通過其學術工作展示了理解聖經需要聖約神學、古代近東背景、以及聖經作者自己所運用的預表性閱讀方法的知識。這種解經能力的水平不可能從一群未受訓練之人分享印象的圈子中產生。

Rev. Deacon Professor Dr. Sherman Kuek OFS has articulated the importance of the academic and spiritual disciplines working together in the interpretation of Scripture—a synthesis that repudiates the false assumption that anyone, regardless of training, can offer equally authoritative readings of biblical texts.

許閣博士執事教授 OFS闡述了學術與靈性操練在聖經解釋中協同工作的重要性——這一綜合否定了一個錯誤假設，即任何人，無論訓練如何，都能對聖經文本提供同等有權威的解讀。

Ray Comfort, whose evangelistic ministry has reached millions, demonstrates that even in evangelistic settings—where simplicity is valued—the teacher maintains authority over the biblical content. Comfort's methodology involves teaching what the Bible says, not asking unbelievers what they think the Bible means. If this principle governs evangelism, how much more should it govern the education of believers in small group settings?

Ray Comfort，其佈道事工已觸及數百萬人，展示了即使在佈道場景中——那裡重視簡潔——教師也保持對聖經內容的權柄。Comfort的方法論涉及教導聖經所說的，而非詢問不信者他們認為聖經的意思是什麼。如果這一原則管轄佈道，那麼它更應當管轄在小組場景中信徒的教育。

Dr. Michael Brown, the Messianic Jewish scholar and apologist, has repeatedly called for a return to serious, biblically-grounded engagement with Scripture that takes the original languages, historical context, and theological depth seriously. His extensive

work demonstrates what proper Bible study looks like: rigorous, informed, and submitted to the text's own authority.

Michael Brown博士，彌賽亞猶太學者和護教家，反覆呼籲回歸對聖經認真的、以聖經為根基的研讀——認真對待原文語言、歷史語境和神學深度。他的大量著作展示了正確查經的面貌：嚴謹的、有知識的、順服經文自身權威的。

Dave Armstrong, the Catholic apologist, has written extensively on the problems of *sola scriptura* when divorced from interpretive authority—demonstrating that even within the Protestant framework, the necessity of qualified teachers and authoritative interpretation cannot be escaped. His work, while addressing inter-confessional questions, highlights the absurdity of treating every layperson's opinion as equally authoritative.

Dave Armstrong，天主教護教家，廣泛撰文論述唯獨聖經脫離解釋權威時的問題——展示即使在新教框架內，合格教師和帶有權威之解釋的必要性也是不可逃避的。他的著作雖然涉及宗派間的問題，卻突顯了將每位平信徒的意見視為同等有權威的荒謬性。

XIII. CONCLUSION: A CALL TO REPENTANCE AND REFORMATION / ENBILĪSNA: WĀKĀSNA PRĒI ENGRAUDĪSNAN BE REFORMĀCIJAN / 結論：悔改與改革的呼召

The "tea party" model of Bible study—characterized by idle talk, empty laughter, absence of qualified teaching, and the elevation of uninformed personal opinion to the status of biblical interpretation—is not merely a pedagogical failure. It is a spiritual sin against the Word of God. It violates the clear teaching of 2 Peter 1:20–21, which forbids private interpretation. It violates James 3:1, which restricts the teaching office to those prepared to bear its weight. It violates Ephesians 5:4, which forbids frivolous speech in the assembly of saints. It violates 2 Timothy 2:15, which demands trained, careful

handling of the Word. And it violates the pattern of Christ Himself, who taught with authority and did not solicit opinions.

「茶會」模式的查經——以閒談、空洞的笑聲、缺乏合格教導、以及將不知情之個人意見提升到聖經解釋地位為特徵——不僅僅是教學法的失敗。它是對神話語的屬靈犯罪。它違反了彼得後書一章20-21節的明確教導——該處禁止私意解經。它違反了雅各書三章1節——該處將教導職分限制於那些預備承擔其重量之人。它違反了以弗所書五章4節——該處禁止在聖徒聚會中的輕浮言語。它違反了提摩太後書二章15節——該處要求對話語受過訓練的、仔細的處理。而它違反了基督本人的模式——祂以權柄教導，不徵求意見。

"Tējas swēntas" mōdelis Bīblijas studijas—charakterizēts ezze tūsnas klabāsnas, pāustas smējas, absēncijas kwalificētas mukinsnas, be enaukstinsnas neinfōrmētas persōniskas opīnijas prēi statūsan bībliskas interpretācijas—ni ast tēngi pedagōgiskas treppisna. Ōns ast dwāssiska grēka prēi Dēiwas Bilān. Ōns perlāužā klāran mukinsnan 2 Pēteris 1:20-21, ka draudā priwātan interpretācijan. Ōns perlāužā Jakōbus 3:1, ka aulāikā mukinsnas amtan prēi stēimans preparēwintans nēstwei sēisan swāran. Ōns perlāužā Efēziōi 5:4, ka draudā leichtsiniskan klabāsnan en sēiminiskā swintāmans. Ōns perlāužā 2 Timōtejus 2:15, ka prawērstā izmukintan, zūrgingan drūktāsnan Bilāsses. Be ōns perlāužā prōtotypan Kristus Pašas, kas mukinnā sen autōritātin be ni prassā opīnijans.

The churches that have adopted this model must repent. They must restore qualified teachers to positions of authority in small groups. They must eliminate the roundtable of ignorance that masquerades as "community." They must return to the reading, exposition, and application of Scripture under trained leadership. They must replace idle laughter with reverent attention, and personal opinion with sound exegesis.

那些採用了這一模式的教會必須悔改。他們必須在小組中恢復合格教師的權威地位。他們必須消除那偽裝成「團契」的無知圓桌。他們必須在受過訓練之領袖的帶領下回歸聖經的誦讀、解說和應用。他們必須用虔敬的專注取代閒散的笑聲，用健全的釋經取代個人意見。

Eklēsijas kas ast preiiēmusas šin mōdelin turri engraudītwei. Ōnas turri restaurētwei kwalificēwintans mukinātajans en pōzicijans autōritātas en ūnkrans grūpans. Ōnas turri eliminētwei kruglan stālan nezināsnas ka maskēi si kāigi "kōmūnija." Ōnas turri ergrīztwei prēi skaitāsnan, ezpōzicijan, be applikācijan Skriptūras pō izmukintan wadāsnan. Ōnas turri perlāikītwei tūsnan smējan sen reverēntiskan attencijan, be persōniskan opīnijan sen sūndan ezegēsin.

As G.C. Lewis Sr. has reminded the Church: the seriousness of handling God's Word cannot be overstated. The eternal souls of men and women are at stake. False interpretation leads to false doctrine, false doctrine leads to false practice, and false practice leads to spiritual destruction.

正如 G.C. Lewis Sr. 所提醒教會的：處理神話語之嚴肅性怎樣強調都不為過。男男女女永恆的靈魂正處於危險之中。錯誤的解經導致錯誤的教義，錯誤的教義導致錯誤的實踐，而錯誤的實踐導致屬靈的毀滅。

Let the Church hear the Word of the Lord and return to faithful, reverent, disciplined study of Holy Scripture—in small groups as in all other settings—under the guidance of those whom God has called and equipped to teach.

願教會聽見主的話語，回歸對聖經忠信的、虔敬的、有紀律的研讀——在小組中如同在所有其他場景中一樣——在神所呼召並裝備來教導之人的引導下。

Lāi Eklēsija klausī Bilān Rikījas be ergrīztā prēi tikrōman, reverēntiskan, disciplinēwintan studijan Swintāns Skriptūrans—en ūnkrans grūpans kāigi en wissans kitans pāusans—pō wadīsnan stēisan kans Dēiws ast wākinuns be izmukinuns mukīntwei.

"No prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation." — 2 Peter 1:20

「經上所有的預言沒有可隨私意解說的。」——彼得後書一章20節

"Ni ainan prōphēcija Skriptūras ast ainassei priwātas interpretācijas." — 2 Pēteris 1:20

Soli Deo Gloria.

惟獨榮耀歸於神。

Ainasmu Dēiwu Gārban.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF AUTHORITIES CITED / IZBILĪTA BIBLIŌGRAPHIJA AUTŌRITĀTANS CITĒWINTANS / 所引用權威之精選參考書目

The insights and methodologies referenced in this essay draw upon the following teachers and works, whose collective witness—spanning Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox traditions—unanimously affirms the necessity of qualified, reverent, exegetical engagement with Holy Scripture rather than the casual, opinion-driven "tea party" model:

本文所引用的洞見和方法論援引了以下教師和著作，他們的集體見證——橫跨新教、天主教和東正教傳統——一致肯定了以合格的、虔敬的、釋經式的方式研讀聖經之必要性，而非隨意的、以意見為驅動的「茶會」模式：

葉光明 (Derek Prince), Charles H. Spurgeon, George Despodov神父, Cajetan Cuddy神父, Manuel Acuña主教, Paul Truebenbach神父, Josiah Trenham神父, Evdokym神父, Moses McPherson神父, Josh McPherson, 約翰·麥克阿瑟 (John F. MacArthur), 唐崇榮牧師 (Pastor Stephen Tong), N.T. Wright, Cliffe Knechtle, Voddie Baucham, Dr. Tom Wadsworth, Robby Gallaty, Nate Sala, Ray Comfort, Jordan Peterson, Robert Barron主教, Gary Hamrick, Dr. Michael S. Heiser, Jeffery Poor, Dr. Leighton Flowers, William

Lane Craig, Stephen De Young神父, Dr. Chuck Missler, 查理·柯克 (Charlie Kirk), Bro Dr Prem, Dr. Douglas Hamp, Dr. Craig Keener, Kenny Burchard, Dave Armstrong, John Lennox, Daniel Maritz (DLM Christian Lifestyle), David Diga Hernandez, Sergiy Nezhbort神父, Chris Alar神父, Donald Calloway神父, Dan Reehil神父, Vlad Savchuk, Matt Mason (Lion of Fire Ministries), Dr. John Bergsma, Arlen Khachatourians, Dr. Michael Brown, Karlo Broussard博士, Rikhard Hartikainen, Chad Ripperger神父, Carlos Martins神父, Mark Goring神父, Daniel Seo神父, Sergiy Faley司祭, Oleg Kovalenko神父, 許閣博士執事教授 (Rev. Deacon Professor Dr. Sherman Kuek OFS), Jessica Murray (Craft to Christ), Lazarus El Antony神父, Leo Patalinghug神父 (The Father Leo Show), Loran Livingston牧師, Dr. Thomas Madden, Hans Jacobse神父, Stephen Rossetti閣下, Seraphim Aldea神父, Frank Turek, Dr. Dojcin Zivadinovic, Vincent Lampert神父, Mark Batush, Alvin Plantinga, J. Warner Wallace, Robert Jamieson (*Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*, 1871), Matthew Henry (*Matthew Henry's Concise Commentary*), G.C. Lewis Sr.

This essay was composed in English, Prussian (Old Prussian, using reconstructed and neologistic forms based on the Catechisms and the revived language corpus of Mikkels Klussis and Letas Palmaitis), and Chinese.

Šī skriptūra bēi kōmpōnēwintā en Angliskan, Prūsiskan (Senapprūsiskan, tērpanti rekōnstruēwintans be neolōgistiskans fōrmans grūntēwintans en Katēkismans be atwīwintā bilāsses kōrpusan Mikkels Klussis be Letas Palmaitis), be Kīniskan.

本文以英文、普魯士語（古普魯士語，使用基於教理問答書及*Mikkels Klussis*與*Letas Palmaitis*之復興語言語料庫的重構與新創形式）、及中文撰寫。

Note on Old Prussian ecclesiastical titles employed in this essay:

In Old Prussian, the title "Father" (as used for priests, "Fr.") is rendered as **Tāws** (from the attested Sambian form *tāws* = "father," cf. the Lord's Prayer fragment *Towe Nüsze*). "Bishop" is rendered as **Wāldninks** (lit. "ruler/governor," reconstructed from attested *waldnikans* in the Catechisms, appropriate for the episcopal office of oversight). "Monsignor" is rendered as **Auktimmēts** (a neologism from *aukts* "high" + a derivative suggesting honor, reflecting the honorific nature of the title).